App. F. IX-4

Previous References

C-30 ? ?

193 D. Mugrai)

File No. 329-30

Serial Nos. 1 - 8

Later References

Mug 108-32-A
T 2139-(57)

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 8

Part B for December 31

SUBJECT.

Appeal re encroachment on the boundary of the Nanasundareswarar temple at Tiruvarur

---

General and Revenue Secretariat | Muz File No. of 1930.1

Serial No.

Review petition of 25/5/1931 filed by Mr. N. Ramaiyangar on behalf of B. Narayana Reddi Son of Bypa Reddi Mallasandra Village Bagepalli Taluk in the matter of cess due from him on his lease and to him in respect of the Sri Adi Narayana Swamy Temple.

(1) Vide [Endt No 1791/Muz 4-30-9 of 13/2/31 to Mr Selva Srinivasa Iyengar the then Advocate for the petitioner. He has been informed that there are no reasons to interfere with the orders already passed by the M.C. in the matter. The appl has been rejected also on the ground that it was time-barred.

13-2-31
25-6-31
Delay 3 months 11 days.

(2) Again the review appl now received is time barred - If appd, it will be rejected -

28/5

(3) Please ascertain from the M.C. if the statement made in para 1 of the Review petition that the order was communicated to the Petr only on 3.12.30 is correct.

VS
1.6.31

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 02553—G PB—50,000—8 7 30

File No of 193 | General and Revenue Secretariat

3) It is ascertained from the office of the M-e That in No D. dis 56/29-30 dt 3.9.29 an Endt intimating the rejection of the appeal was issued to Narayana Reddi, the present petitioner. The Statement made in para 1 of the P. R-D is [illegible]

FIN... 7398 9 JUNE ... GEN...

2/6

5) Submitted for orders if the petn may be rejected.

H. Secy 2/6/31

VS 2.6.31

1 1931 269

1st member 7) 8/6/31

8) Please get officially information on this point. When was the application When was M-t's order communicated to him, when did he ask for a copy & when was it given to him?

Mng 10/6/31

VS

9) 3 1916 Issue

VS 11.6.31

10) O. su. No 2678 dt 12.6.31 to the Mining Commissioner Cuttack for information thereinreferred to

15/6/31

General and Revenue Secretariat I/12 File No. 328 of 193

Serial No.

Letter no 1906/30-31 dt 20/6/31 from the Muzdai Commissioners furnishing the information called for.

11) Information furnished in paras 2 & 3 of the P.N. D2 maybe substituted in the minutes in para 8. Point referred to in para 2 is for orders —

28/6 26/6 First Member 12) 26.6.31

13) Please note on the Contention that the appeal is in time with ref to information obtained —

27/6/31

14) Secn 38.(5) of Regn VII of 1927 runs as follows "No appeal shall be brought after the expiration of 30 days of the decision or order complained of have been passed by an officer inferior in rank to a Deputy Commissioner, nor after the expiration of ninety days in any other case."

15) In para 2 of the P.N. D

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

WD 02553—G PB—50,000—8 7 30

(4)

Mug File No. 329 of 1930-1 | General and Revenue Secretariat

It is stated that the order in M.C. of 26/8/1929 was communicated to the appellant on 3.9.1929. This point was noted in deciding the appeal - Vide para 2 of Mug 4-30. M.

(6) In para 1 of the Review petn it is stated that the petitioner was informed of the order only on 3/12/1930 as per G.L. No 685 of 30-31.

From whom this information was got by the party is not stated. The statement of the M.C. has to be relied upon in the absence of definite proof to the contrary. The office of the M.C. can only post an Endt intimating the order of the Commissioner to the party. As regards its receipt, it is the out look of the party.

(7) It would appear from the provision of the Regn above quoted that the ninety days allowed for appeal would run from the date of the passing of the order

(8) The Asstt to Law Secy may be consulted of this interpretation to Consel. (before Submission) or G.S. with of time for appeal runs from date of communication 9/7 or from date of receipt of such communication by the pe and whether the same rule applies to the filing of reviews as of appeals in regard to time

Asstt. Secy
Secy. with Complete)

VS
9.7.31

General and Revenue Secretariat — File No. 529 of 193 .

Serial No.

19) In the Limitation Regulation, which prescribes the periods within which appeals or applications in Civil Courts may be filed, the time from which such period is to be computed is always mentioned in the third Column of the Schedule - In Sec 38(1) of Reg VII of 1927 as also in the Corresponding section of the L R Code, this is not done. Since however the orders under the Religious & charitable Endowments Regn are to be passed after enquiry and under Sec 20 of the L R Code, the decision has to be in public and after notice to parties, it must be the date of the decision or order from which time for appeal begins to run - The fact that the parties had no knowledge of the decision, may in bonafide circumstances be a point for condoning the delay in the filing of appeals etc -

20) As to the question as to whether the same rule applies in case of revision petitions also, it must be noted that neither the L R Code nor the Reg VII of 1927 enables a party to ask for a review of a Court order already passed - If Court reviews their own orders, it must be only in the exercise of its inherent powers, and no time

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

6

Mus File No. 329. of 1930-1 | General and Revenue Secretariat

time limit can be fixed for exercise of such powers.

Asst Secy, Mun Pr
with comps

8/law

10/7/31

1) Attn requ with minutes of the First Member of Council in Para 13, Petr is respectfully invited to paras 15, 16, 17-19 of the office notes - supra.

Sd VS
11/7/31

First Member VS
11.7.31

Did the M.C give a hearing to the petrs and was the decision communicated to him when the case was heard? or was an endorsement only sent to him on 3.9.29? Note the relevant dates. The noting of the case is not helpful. I want to know if the petrs is to blame for the delay in obtaining a Mus copy of the order (2).3/

1) It is necessary to go through the connected records of the office of the M.C to furnish information regd in paras 2,3. VS

Sd VS
6.8.31

Subs Letter may be put up for orders

Sd MSK
16/7

Let a letter Draft to the Advocate may issue now in for consideration

25 Issue the letter to the M.C

VS
20.7.31.

General and Revenue Secretariat

R/43 File No 329 c. 193

Serial No	
4	No 120 dt 22.7.1931 to the Muzaffarnagar Commissioner calling for additional information and submission of this office records on the subject. Letter no 1906/30-31 dt 28/7/31 from the Muzaffarnagar Commissioner furnishing information called for on 12.7.1931.
×D	*Vide page 4 of record received from the M.C. The M.C. has recorded "Appellant heard and orders reserved orders were passed by him on 9.8.29 in the case - The Office Assistant moved an Endt to be issued to the party on 26.8.29 and the Endt was issued on 3.9.29. Subject to reference to para 23. 27 Whether the Endorsement dt 3-9-29 was received in the usual course of postal service by the party or he had intimation of the order only on 3-12-30 as stated by his advocate is the point on which the clemency of the higher Offr in regard to the admission of the appeal will depend. A draft to the Advocate is for consideration in case it is to pursue this question
9-8 3077	
30/7/31 28	First Member) VS 1.8.31

Contn Sheet

2 AUG 1931 No 892

WD 02553—G PB—50,000—8 7 30

No: 1992

3° As the case has been ordered to be posted for a hearing, it is necessary to obtain entire records connected with the case

Issue

No 216 dt 7.8.1931 to the Mazvai Commissioner Calling for the remaining records connected with the case stated therein.

Letter No 1906/30-31 dt 13.10.31 from the Mazvai Commissioner forwarding records connected with the appeal of Narayana Reddi of Tallasamudram Village Bageppalli Taluk about the levy of cesses on lands endowed to Sri Adinarayana Swami temple at Jekkodu.

33 The facts in the case are set forth in the preamble portion of appl No 53 of 28-29 dt 30.9.29 on the file of the Mazvai Court Cuddapah. As seen from records the petitioner, Mr Narayana Reddi in every one of his statements before Mr. Amildar Gudibanda has agreed that the free kanduyam on the lands other than the land belonging to the temple exists as therein.

34 Mr Dy. Amildar of Gudibanda to

Mu3 Review-1930-31

App. F. III—27

General and Revenue Secretariat — Mu3 File No. 329 of 1930.

Serial No.

2177

In this report of 31.5.29 reports that in the case of lands of the same temple leased out to others full assessment including cesses is being collected. The same lands had been leased prior to this to one Lakshmana Reddi for Rs 350/- p.a. and the duration of the lease was varying for 5 years. In view of the main land leased out being dry ex lands (viz 20 ac & 2 cg) & the period of lease remaining for 20 years, there are no reasons for interfering with the decision of the M.C.

35) If agreed, this will be posted for hearing with the next batch of cases for hearing.

36) Memo — 29/10/30 (sd) H. Secy) 30.10

37) 2nd member 31/10/31

35) Yes SPR 2/11

38) Heard the advocate 3.11.31
Order reserved

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

File N of 19 . | General and Revenue Secretariat

Order

I heard the advocate the applicant + I see no reason to reconsider my interfere into the order already passed

JPM
14/12

16.12.31

Issue
22.12.31



Copy of order issued to the Revenue Memo No. 878 dated 24.12.31.

Copy to R.C. with record No. 898 dt 28.12.31



Muz 329 - 30 - 1

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

Muzrai Review Petition No. of 30-31.

Petitioner.

B.Narayana Reddy,
Son of Bypa Reddy,
Mallasandra Village,
Bagepally Taluk.

****

Under Section 22 of the Mysore Muzrai Regulation - Regulation No.VI of 1913 - the petitioner most respectfully begs that the order No.1791/Muzrai 4-30-9 dated 10th/13th February 1931 passed in his Appeal, against the decision of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore in Muzrai Appeal No.53 of 28-29 on his file, be kindly reviewed and revised for the following reasons among others:-

The Endorsement (order) rejecting the petitioner's appeal before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja mentions that the appeal was barred by time. The petitioner submits that he was informed of the order disposing of his appeal No.53 of 28-29 by the learned Muzrai Commissioner only on 3-12-1930 as per G.L.No.685 of 30-31.

respectfully submits that he immediately i.e., on 6-12-1930 obtained a certified copy from the Muzrai Commissioner's office and filed the Appeal before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, on 16-1-31.

3. The petitioner submits that from the aforesaid dates, it will be clearly seen, only a month and ten days have been taken by the petitioner, whereas he is clearly entitled to a period of ninety days according to Land Revenue Code to prefer his appeal.

4. The petitioner therefore submits that his appeal will not be out of time and the petitioner has ample reasonsto explain the delay.

5. The order of the learned Muzrai Commissioner is very short, and is in a sentence, whereby he simply agrees with the learned Deputy Commissioner, Kolar District. The learned Muzrai Commissioner has not considered any grounds urged by the petitioner to show that the lease entered into by him did not include the cesses demanded of the petitioner.

6. The learned Deputy Commissioner and the Muzrai Commissioner have failed to consider that what was owing by the petitioner in respect of Sri Adi Narayanaswamy Temple lands was only Gutta and not Kandayam. The petitioner submits that if a hearing be granted to him, he will be able to convince the -

the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, the implications contained in the terms and the extent to which the petitioner is - liable per annum to the Government.

7. The petitioner's point is that though the Government Officers have granted the lands for a certain annual premium, they have only done so, for and on behalf of - Sri Adi Narayana Swamy, for the lands belong to that Temple. The petitioner is only a lessee paying Rs.283-8-0 annually to the - Temple.

8. The distinction between the terms occupant, and inferior holder as employed in the Land Revenue Code to levy Kandayam and to secure Survey guarantees on the one hand, and a lessee and tenant under the - Transfer of Property Act restricting his liability to pay the amount agreed for to the lessor and Land-lord have not been - observed by the Muzrai Officers - and their decisions are erroneous and the petitioner craves permission to enable him to put the right view before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

9. That the present demand by the - Revenue Officers of cesses from the petitioner is highly inconsistent with the nature of the holding that the petitioner has and is given in respect of the lands.

10. The orders that have been passed against the petitioner making him liable

liable to pay the cesses are highly inequitable, unsympathetic, and illegal.

The petitioner most respectfully prays that he be kindly heard in support of this petition and such orders as are legal and equitable be kindly passed.

Bangalore,
D/25-5-1931.

N. Ramadyengar—
Advocate for Petitioner.



In the Court of

Before the Government of His Highness
His Majesty of Mysore

15

Writ Petition No. of 193 -1931 .

Appellant Plaintiff		Respondent Defendant
Petitioner: B. Narayanaswamy Reddiar of Kadasamudram Village Bagepalli Tq	Vs.	

I, The Petitioner above named do, by these presents, retain

~~Messrs BELUR SRINIVASIENGAR, B.A., B.E. M.I.C.E., M.R.A.~~
and N. RAMA IYENGAR, B.A., L.L.B., Advocates

to appear and conduct the above case on my behalf to judgment.

2. I further empower them to do all necessary acts in the above case, to execute any decree or order that may be passed in my behalf and to receive from the Court all documents, refunds and all sums of money that I may be entitled to get and grant receipts therefor

3. I also undertake to confirm and ratify all the acts done by the said Advocates or by any other Advocate on their behalf in so doing

B. Narayanaswamy Reddiar

25-5-1931,
BANGALORE.

Personally known to us and signed in our presence.—ACCEPTED.

N Rama Iyengar
Advocates.

Advocates for.....

Indian Press, B. City.

App. F. G. 9]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. 2678 Original petn Maz. Revision no 1980-31

The accompanying Petition Registered No. 1597 dated 25/5/31 received at the General and Revenue Secretariat from Dwd Mr B. Narayana Reddi Sons of Byra Reddi Mallasandra Village Bagepalli Tk in the matter of payment of rents by him on lands leased out to him in respect of the Sri Adi Narayana Swami Temple at Yellodu

is forwarded, ~~together with its enclosures~~ to the M.-C for the making in formation on the following points at a very early date.

1) Whether the M.-C's order was communicated and sent to the party by the C's office and the number and date of the communication by which the order in Mysz appl no. 530 28-29 on the file of this court were communicated to the ~~appellant~~ petitioner

2) The date on which Mr Narayana Reddi applied for a copy of the order in the said appeal case.

3) The date of the delivery of the copy to the party.

By Order,

Secretary. 11.6.31

BANGALORE, ... 19.....

[P. T. O.

WD 02048 -GPB—3750—8-8-28

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್.... ... .ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು

....ಹೋಬಳಿ

....ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ

....ಗೆ

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ಸ್ ಹಂಕುಂ.

....

. ...

....

....

.. ..

. ...

....

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕ್ಕೊಂಡ ....

ಮುಕ್ಕುಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು. . ... ಬಗ್ಯೆ

. .. .

....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order,

Secretary.

M. C. 13]

No. 1906/30-31
Encl.

OFFICE OF THE MU[illegible] ISSIONER,
IN MYS[illegible],
Bangalore, 18th June 1931.

1693-
[illegible]

FROM

Mus 329-30-3

S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

20 JUNE 1931

To

Rajasevaprasakta
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial *Department.*

SIR,

(1) With reference to your U.I.No.2678/Muz.dated 18th June 1931, calling for certain information on the Review petition of Mr.Narayana Reddy of Mallasandra in the matter of payment of cesses on temple -- lands at Yellodu, leased out to him, I have the honor to state as follows:-

(2) The Muzrai Commissioner's order No.D1 Dis.56/29-30 dated 26th August 1929 was communicated to the petitioner direct from this ----- office by means of an endorsement on 3rd September 1929.

(3) Mr. Narayana Reddi applied for a copy of the order in the said appeal case on 6th December 1930 & it was delivered to him the same day.

The Review petition received with your memo is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Y Narasinga Rau

~~For~~ Muzrai Commissioner.

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್..... ....

....

....

....

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಲು.

....,... .. ....

.. ..

. ...

....

.. ..

....

....

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ .....

ಮರುಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು. ....

....

....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Or

Secretary.

18

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL SECRETARIAT,

No 140 / Muzrai 325-30-14

Bangalore, Dated 20th July 1931.
21st

From

Rajasevaparayana
B. SRINIVASA IYENGAR, Esq, B.A BL,
Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

To

The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,
Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.1906/30-31 dated 20th June 1931 furnishing information required in connection with the Review petition of Mr. Narayana Reddi of Hallasandra Village, Bagepalli Taluk, I am directed to enquire if you gave a hearing to the petitioner in Muzrai Appeal No.53 of 1928-29 and whether the decision was communicated to him when the case was heard or whether an endorsement only was sent to him on 3rd September 1929. A reply at an early date is requested.

The connected appeal records of your office only (DI Dis 56/29-30) may also be sent for perusal and return.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

V Subramanyasastri

For Secretary to Government,
25 Financial Department.

RS/2

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT .....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
the *193* .

Date of issue 27/7/31

Signed by Mrs V. S. Krishna

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section Misc 3

File No 329—30

Serial No. 4

No. 120

To

M. C.

Sir,

With ref^ce to your letter No 1906/30-31 dt 20/6/31 furnishing information required in connection with the Revision pet^n of Sri Narayana Reddi of Mallasandra Village Bagepalli Tk, I am directed if you gave to enquire of a hearing to the pet^r in Misc A&M No 53 of 1928-29 and whether the decision was communicated to him when

[over

WD02559—GPB—25,000—25-6-30

the case was heard or wherein
an Ench only was sent to him
on 3.9.29 - A reply at an early
date is requested.

The connected appeal
records of your office only (D, dis 56/29-30
may also be sent for perusal.
and return —

I have the
VB 20.7.31
honour to be
Sir
Your most
obedient
servant

98
10/7

No. 1906/17 & 30-31

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE,

Bangalore,..... 22nd July..... .....193 1.

26

FROM

S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

Rajasevaparayana
P. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.

Secretary to Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial *Department.*



SIR,

With reference to your letter No. 130/Muz.629-30-4 dated 22-7-31, enquiring if a hearing was given to the petitioner in Muzrai Appeal No.53/28-29, I have the honor to state that the office note contained in this office record No. D1 Dis.56/29-30 dated 3-9-'29, is recorded by the Muzrai Commissioner, 'Appellant heard, orders reserved.

An endorsement that the appeal has been rejected was issued to the appellant on 3-9-29.

The connected appeal record is herewith submitted for kind perusal and return.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Yeraswiga Ray

AM/ for Muzrai Commissioner.

Ds 216/Revenue 329-30-6

20

6th August 1931.

7th

S.P. Rajagopalachari, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

With reference to correspondence ending with your letter No. 1906 of 1930-31 dated 28th July 1931 forwarding only your Office record No. D1.Dis.56 of 1929-30 dated 3rd September 1929 rejecting the appeal of Narayana Reddi of Mallasandra village, Bagepalli Taluk, regarding the levy from him of cesses in connection with the lease of lands endowed to Sri Adi Narayanaswami of Yellodu village, I am directed to request you to be so good as to obtain and forward all the remaining records connected with the case for reference.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
V Subrahmanyasastri
for Financial Secretary to Government.

C.R.G.2.

RS

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Mvs

File No. 329-30

Serial No. 6

No. 216

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

To

The H.C.

Date of issue 7/8/31

Signed by.....

Sir,

I am directed to forward herewith a copy of correspondence ending with the letter from the Collector of Jaffna No. 1906/30-31 of 28-7-31 forwarding an application dated 26th instant from Mr. Arumugam Ramanathan of Malleswaram Village Nagerkoil Tk regarding the lease of certain lands endowed to the Adi Ramanathan Swami Kovil of Jellatchi Village

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

I am directed to request
you to be so good as to
obtain and forward to us
all
remaining records connected
with the case for reply
~~and return~~.

I have the
[illegible]
to be
Your obedient servant
[illegible]

7 S
24/8

Mug 329-30-7

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE,

25

Bangalore, 13. *193* .

FROM

S. [illegible], [illegible], [illegible],
SYPU RAJAGOPALACHARI, ESQUIRE, B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

[illegible],
Secretary to Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,

GENL & REV. DEPTS.
395
14 OCT 1931
MUZRAI

SIR,

With reference to your letter No. [illegible] dated 7-8-31,

calling for the furnishing of the [illegible] in the case of [illegible], [illegible], [illegible],

Before the Government of His Highness the

Maharaja of Mysore.

Muzrai Review petition No. 19 of 1930-31.

Petitioner.

B. Narayana Reddi, son of Bypa Reddi,
Mallasandra village, Bagepalli
Taluk.

Subject.

Prayer for a reconsideration of orders passed about the collection of cesses from the petitioner in respect of Inam lands situated in Chintalavarapalli, Kothur, Goribidanur Taluk, belonging to the Sri Adinarayanaswami temple of Yellodu village, leased out to him.

The case was heard on 30th November 1931. The petitioner was present and was also represented by his Advocate Mr. N. Rama Iyengar.

Order.

Government see no reason to reconsider the orders already passed.

Memo No. 878 / Muz 389-30-8 dated, Bangalore, the 23rd Dec., 1931.

Copy of the above is forwarded to Mr N. Rama Iyengar, Advocate, Bangalore City for information and Communication to the petitioner.

By order,

V Sethumanyasastri

for Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

C.R.G.4.

Before the Government of His Highness the

Maharaja of Mysore.

Muzrai Review petition No. 19 of 1930-31.

Petitioner.

B. Narayana Reddi, son of Eypa Reddi,
Mallasandra village, Bagepalli
Taluk.

Subject.

Prayer for a reconsideration of orders passed about the collection of cesses from the petitioner in respect of Inam lands situated in Chintalavarapalli, Kothur, Coribidanur Taluk, belonging to the Sri Adinarayanaswami temple of Yellodu village, leased out to him.

The case was heard on 30th November 1931. The petitioner was present and was also represented by his Advocate Mr. N. Rama Iyengar.

Order.

Government see no reason to reconsider the orders already passed.

Memo No. 898/Muz 329-30 Encls 3 files dated, Bangalore, the 23rd Dec. 1931.

Copy of the above is forwarded to with Compliments to the Muz Comr returning records received with his letters nos 1506 of 1930-31 & 28-7-31 and 13th October 31. A Copy of the previous G.O. No. 1791/Muz 6-30-9 & 13-2-31 by order,
sent to the Advocate for the petitioner & Subrahmanyasastri
on that date is also enclosed.

for Secretary to Government,
Financial Department

C.R.G.4.

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

The Review ~~Appeal~~ No. 19 of 1930-31

~~Appellant.~~ ~~Vs.~~ Respondent

Petitioner.

B. Narayana Reddi
Son of Byra Reddi - Mallasandra Village.
Bagepalli Tk.

Subject.

Prayer for reconsideration of orders passed about the Collection of cesses from petitioner in respect of lands in Chikkalagondapalli Village, Gowribidanur Tk. belonging to the Inam Institution and leased out to him.

The case was heard on 30th Novr. 1931. The petitioner was present and was represented by his advocate Mr. N. Rama Iyengar

Order

Govt see no reasons to reconsider the orders already passed.

No 878 dated 3-12-30

Copy to Mr. N. Rama Iyengar Advocate, Bagepalli for the petitioner.

B-O

22/12/31 P. T. O

For Secy to Govt

GPB—1,000—S.S 11

Memo No 3

Copy of the above is forwarded to m.c returning records received with his letter no 1906/30-31 dt 28/7/31 and 13-10-31. Copy of the final order no 1791/Mag 4(c) 30-9 dt 13.2.31 sent to the Advocate for the petitioner on the date is also enclosed - The m.c. is requested to issue necessary instructions to the concerned officers for collection at a very early date of arrears due outstanding against the petitioner.

B-O

22.12.31

Dr Sd/- Malone

Asst Dept

Sd/-
21/12

RECEIVED
DEC 19
DF